
FIRST-YEAR WRITING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT 2015-16

By Ginny Crisco

“Writing may be by far the single academic skill most closely associated with college success [. . .]”
(5) --David T. Conley *Redefining College Readiness*

INTRODUCTION

In April 2015, Dr. Frank Lamas, Bernard Vinovrski, Maxine McDonald, Tina Beddall, and Dr. Andres Hernandez released a report entitled “Bold New Vision for Developmental Education and Student Success at Fresno State.” This report included several implications for the First-Year writing program in the English Department including:

- **RECOMMENDATION #1:** reevaluate the cut off scores for the SAT and the ACT to better evaluate the competence of students.
- **RECOMMENDATION #2:** Use only the SAT or ACT as appropriate benchmarks for evaluating student’s competence in English and math and make the EPT and ELM optional.
- **RECOMMENDATION #5:** Change the purpose and intent of Early Start courses from an experience to a preparation requirement for challenge exams that must be taken at the end of the course.
- **RECOMMENDATION #6:** For English, offer SI to students who are already taking the GE English through various methodologies.

In response to the “Bold New Vision for Developmental Education and Student Success at Fresno State,” the First-Year Writing Program provides the following program assessment report. This report on our First-Year Writing Program, informed by the current scholarship on Composition Studies and Writing Program Administration proposes the following:

- Directed Self Placement (DSP, our current placement mechanism) with an exit assessment is the most reliable, appropriate, student-centered placement mechanism that, as a practice and an approach toward placement, has CSU-wide and scholarly support.
- Research in our discipline and assessment research in our program shows that test scores are not the best placement mechanism for students and should only be used – if used at all – to advise students -- within the more important context of student self-efficacy (defined below).
- In comparison to our new program, our previous program, which used mainstreaming (one course for all students with supplemental instruction) had higher failure rates and lower retention rates, as our research data shows.

- Students on this campus should be exempt from the Early Start requirement as the philosophy (placing students into a course based on test scores) is in direct opposition to Directed Self-Placement (students place themselves based on their self-efficacy as writers with test scores as a guide).
- Based on the current scholarship in the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition and on extensive assessment research in our program, the First-Year Writing Program recommends these measures for improving students' retention and graduation rates: 1) Reduce or eliminate reliance on all timed writing and multiple choice tests for writing placement, 2) Eliminate the Early Start Requirement for English, 3) Reduce writing class sizes from 25 to 20, 4) Reduce full time lecturer load from 5 writing courses to 4 writing courses.

Please see our assessment and analysis below for further explanation.

FIRST-YEAR WRITING PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Students place themselves into one of three options: 1) The Accelerated Option: English 10; 2) The Stretch Option: English 5A and B; or 3) The Option for Multilingual Students: Linguistics 6 and then English 5A and B. English 10 is an accelerated class for students who are already accomplished and confident writers. English 5A and B are courses for average student writers that give them a broad foundation at a slower pace for writing at the university level. Linguistics 6 is a class to prepare students for more academic language usage, since college level language requirements are more challenging than everyday language practices. All courses receive university credit; *we have no remedial courses*. Linguistics 6, English 5A and English 10 all count toward the remediation requirement. English 5B and 10 count as the area A-2 GE writing requirement.

In general, about 60-70% enroll in the Stretch (English 5A/B) option, 30-40% enroll in the Accelerated Option (English 10), and about 2% enroll in the Option for Multilingual Speakers (Ling 6, then 5A/B).

To make their decision, students are sent an email that directs them to a web page with an overview of the options, a Directed Self-Placement Decision Chart (see Appendix A for the Decision Chart), an overview of the courses in each option, and a FAQ page. They also have a presentation at Dog Days orientation, a page to refer to in the Dog Days booklet, and have advisors to help them choose which course would be right for them.

Additionally, when students enter into their first-year writing course (English 5A or 10), teachers conduct a first-week writing sample to continue to direct students. They can be encouraged to choose a different option, be encouraged to enroll in the Writing Center for supplemental instruction, or be given goals to work toward their final portfolio.

Because our program shifts assessment from the entrance to the exit (see below for scholarship about how the DSP works), students are required to create a final portfolio of their work so that the instructor and the students themselves can assess whether or not they have met the requirements of GE level writing by the end of their chosen option. Our program portfolio rubric includes 5 dimensions: Reflection (what they have learned, how they have grown over the course of the option), Reading and Writing Strategies (what strategies they have learned and can use in regard to

critical reading and writing), Summary / Conversation (how to incorporate outside sources into writing, cite them, and avoid plagiarism), Rhetoricity (how they create purposeful writing that is organized and well developed and addresses an audience), and Language Use (including paragraph focus, sentence structure, and grammar). These dimensions are scored on a 6 point scale, where 3 is passing.

FIRST-YEAR WRITING PROGRAM HISTORY AT CSU FRESNO

Before 2000, the First-Year Writing program at Fresno State had English A, which was a remedial, non credit bearing course for students who tested into it, and English 1, which was the course that met the first-year writing requirement. This program was problematic in a variety of ways, and, in 2000, there was new research showing that different approaches, such as mainstreaming (one course with supplemental instruction), might work better for our student population.

From 2000-2006, the First-Year Writing program used what's called in the discipline of Composition, a mainstreaming model. This model put all students in one credit-bearing course that meets the GE area A-2 requirement, and gave students who placed into remedial writing supplemental instruction. We found that this approach worked better than the previous program, but there was confusion between the supplemental instruction students were receiving and the content of their writing classes. Also it was challenging to teach these supplemental instruction courses, and students didn't want to be there. In 2005 when the department hired two new compositionists, we found new developments in the field of Composition about better ways to place students, particularly because it was common for us to find students who had been "misplaced" based on their EPT scores.

In 2006, we moved to Directed-Self Placement with a Stretch Component. We were the first large CSU campus to move in this direction (the first CSU, at all, to do this kind of First-Year Writing Placement was Channel Islands). Currently, 10 other campuses use Directed Self-Placement with a Stretch option (Channel Islands, Chico, Humbolt, Los Angeles, San Bernadino, San Fransisco, San Jose, Stanislaus, Sacramento, and Sonoma). Seventeen campuses include a Stretch option (all of the campuses above plus Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Long Beach, Northridge, Pomona, and Cal Poly). Monterey Bay is currently looking into implementing DSP with a stretch option. Additionally, at least 26 other colleges and universities across the nation also use Directed Self-Placement with a Stretch Option (see appendix B for a list).

DIRECTED SELF PLACEMENT OVERVIEW

Placement discussions on campus have focused on the importance of test scores to place students into the proper classes. Research in our discipline and assessment research in our program show that test scores are not the best placement mechanism for students and should only be used to advise students -- within the more important context of student self-efficacy (defined below).

WHY NOT TEST SCORES?

The National Council of Teachers of English, one of our leading professional organizations, wrote a policy document in 2005 (when the SAT and ACT added a writing component to their tests) on the use of SAT and ACT scores for writing placement entitled "The Impact of SAT and ACT Timed

Writing Tests.” In their introduction, they argue that there are serious concerns for using ACT and SAT kinds of tests for writing placement:

“Our investigation into this chapter [SAT adding a writing component] (and into the timed essay component of the ACT, which is optional) found that many of the concerns about the test that have been expressed in the popular press and in professional forums are warranted. These are serious concerns that speak to the potential of this test to compromise student writers and undermine longstanding efforts to improve writing instruction in the nation’s schools.”

Some of their findings indicate areas of concern in regard to validity and reliability of ACT and SAT writing tests:

- The SAT and ACT are both timed writing tests. This means they have the same reliability and validity as existing time writing tests [such as the EPT]
- “The predictive validity of a short, impromptu, holistically scored essay is severely limited when it comes to predicting first-year course grades, first-year writing performance or retention” (3)
- “The kind of writing skill required to do well on short, timed essay tests has little instructional validity” (3)
- “The SAT writing test [and other, similar tests such as the ACT] was developed for the relatively narrow purpose of college admission decisions and it’s not appropriate for other purposes” (4)

Additionally, Olson and Touchette, authors of a Composition and Writing Program Administration Database entitled CompFAQs “Placement: Testing,” identified these reasons NOT to use timed writing tests like the SAT, ACT or even EPT:

- The SAT and ACT were not designed for use in course placement.
- The tests promote problematic understandings of what good writing is.
- The tests do not provide students with an “authentic” writing situation. There is no time for revision, editing, etc. and hence the *student’s real abilities are not tested* (emphasis mine).
- Traditional studies that only look at correlations between scores and various grades do not take all relevant factors into account (ie: socioeconomics, race, 1st generation college student, etc) and hence provide inaccurate information.
- High school grades are the most reliable indicator of success in college courses.
- *Curriculum based tests are more valid indicators of success* (emphasis mine).

Currently, the California State University uses the English Placement Test (EPT) to place students into remedial writing. The EPT and other standardized, multiple choice, timed writing tests do not place students accurately: Research asserts that timed essay tests at their best only show a 0.5 predictive validity, meaning that they only accurately place students 50% of the time, thereby misplacing students 50% of the time (McKendy; Matzen and Joyt; Breland, Bridgemann, and Fowles).

WHY DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT (DSP)?

Part of the reason the Composition faculty started looking for alternatives to tests such as the EPT is because we already knew about their predictive validity AND we also experienced students' dissatisfaction with their placements. It was common to have students in remedial classes who had bad attitudes about doing the work of the course. Some students who were placed in remedial classes had been in AP classes in high school and resisted being labeled remedial, for example. On the other end, students who might have better belonged in remedial classes carry a stigma attached to them that affects their performance in classes. This stigma of being labeled "remedial" sends a message to (our mostly non-white, second language speaking, first generation college students) that college is not the place for them – from their very first semester (or now, before they even come to college, because of the Early Start requirement.).

Our program moved to DSP to address our student population's needs and to reduce the stigma of remediation. Research by Royer and Gilles, Pinter and Sims, Chernekoff, Cornell and Newton, Frus, Tompkins, and Blakesly, Harvey, and Reynolds demonstrates that students do make accurate placement decisions when directed.

Our program saw the value of students making their own educated choices because that is what college is about: students thinking critically, making decisions, and managing the consequences of those decisions. Research on DSP shows that students can make successful decisions based on their sense of self-efficacy. Erica Reynolds studied self-efficacy in relation to DSP in writing studies; she defines self-efficacy: "Studies conducted by McCarthy, Meier, Rinderer (1985), Bruning, Murphy, and Shell (1989), and Johnson and Pajares (1994) have shown that self-efficacy, which is expressed as a situation and subject-specific personal confidence in one's ability to successfully perform tasks at a given level, is a strong predictor of actual ability" (85).

Additionally, the Stretch Option two-semester course creates learning communities for students, which can lead to higher pass, retention, and graduation rates. According to Greg Glau, students in the stretch program at Arizona State University pass the first-year and second-year writing requirements at a higher rate than those who do not take stretch composition. In addition, according to Glau's article, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and West Chester University in Pennsylvania have also seen improvement in retention and graduation rates with their stretch program. Our program assessment has also seen improvement over our previous program in retention rates (see more on our program assessment below).

Students must pass a final portfolio of their writing in order to pass the English 5B or 10. This moves the assessment for the class from the entrance to the exit (Elbow). The best way to assess students' writing abilities is within a context where they have the opportunity to practice writing as real writers do, rather than base a decision on their placement on a timed writing test, which researchers in our field have demonstrated does not have reliable predictive validity and also has a negative impact on curriculum.

Our program has conducted several years of assessment research that includes indirect measure such as surveys to students and teacher focus groups as well as direct measures, such as portfolio scoring and qualitative comparisons between students' final writing portfolios. Ultimately, our assessment data show that DSP is an acceptably valid placement mechanism, students and teachers feel that students place themselves accurately, teachers feel that the new program is appropriate for the student learners we have on campus, students create better writing in the stretch component, and we have higher retention and pass rates compared with our previous (mainstreaming) program.

DOES DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT WORK?

- DSP and English 5A/B and 10 are appropriate and effective for student learning: “The First-Year Writing Program Assessment Report” (150 pages of assessment and analysis on the first two years of our program), prepared by Asao B. Inoue in 2008, shows the effectiveness of the DSP program and the student learning occurring in the writing program from a variety of direct and indirect evidence: portfolio ratings, portfolio competency measures, teacher commenting data, entry and exit surveys, passing rates, and grade distributions. From these data, the DSP placements appear to be appropriate and effective for student learning. Additionally, the writing program demonstrates learning growth along all outcomes and high levels of satisfaction. In particular, in the analysis section, Inoue states, “. . .the direct and indirect evidence of student learning in both options suggest strongly that in the population at large that DSP is acceptably valid. Students have few problems in the key areas in which data was collected. Most students demonstrate the program outcomes, pass their courses at acceptable rates, achieve overall competency in acceptably high numbers, feel satisfied with their courses, and find their course placements accurate” (97).
- When surveyed over the course of several years (2006-2008 and AY 2013) and by different researchers (Crisco, Inoue, Sansone), students reported 80-95% satisfaction with their choice of classes (see the tables below).

Did you make an accurate placement decision?

	English 5A/B	English 10
Spring 2013 (n=306)	95%	
Fall 2013 (n=278)		83%
2007-08 Entry (n=1248)	83.9%	91.2%
2007-08 Exit (n=1248)	87.7%	96%
Sansone 2007 (n=728)	88%	94%
2006-07 Entry (n=1311)	96%	93%
2006-07 Exit (n=1097)	87%	94%

- In focus groups with teachers who taught in both the old (mainstreaming) program and the new program in 2006-07, teachers reported that the new program was more appropriate for the student learners and that students had more confidence.
 - Teachers of both English 5A/B and 10 report that the range of students in their classes was less broad. One English 10 teacher said that teaching in the old system was very difficult because he had students whose needs weren't met because he would have to go over basic stuff, which felt fundamental to some of the more accomplished students. An English 5A/B teacher said that in the old program, students felt like English 1 was a "dummy class" and that more prepared students felt that others were behind. With the new program, students don't feel that they are above anyone else because they decided to be there, and most students placed themselves accurately in the course.
 - Teachers of both 5A/B and 10 reported that students knew the expectations, pacing, and work of the class coming in, so students were ready to get started. English 5A/B teachers reported that students were more confident in the course because they knew where they were supposed to be. They also reported that students felt more comfortable in the classroom community and because they consciously made the decision they knew what they needed to do. Teachers in English 10 reported that the students in that class seemed more prepared and were more confident about their writing. The teachers ended up expecting more from the students and they were able to get more accomplished in the class. In some cases, students who weren't doing well were being held back by their confidence.
- Teachers who worked in the previous, mainstreaming, program and in the new, DSP, reported that students' morale improved in the new program. Elizabeth Sansone, in her thesis "Determining the Validity of DSP: A Study of Predictive Validity of Directed Self Placement at California State University-Fresno," reported 84% of teachers indicated that student morale was significantly or generally improved.

DO STUDENTS NEED A STRETCH OPTION?

- Pre and post test analyses of student portfolios both from blind readers and from teachers show that students in English 10 consistently start out stronger but students in English 5A/B consistently make more progress over time (See tables below).

How are student portfolios rated overall in blind reading sessions?

	ENGL 10				Diff	ENGL 5A/5B			
	N	Mid	Final	Diff		N	Mid	Final	Diff
AY 2007-08*	125	83.2%	86.4%	3.2%	238	73.9%	99.6%	25.7%	
AY 2008-09	83/7 7	2.46	3.44	0.99	272/23 5	2.81	3.58	0.77	

AY 2009-10	131	2.50	3.38	0.85	156	2.46	3.50	1.04
AY 2010-11	84/38	2.97	3.58	0.61	166/157	2.48	3.22	0.74

* In 2007-08 portfolios, ratings were only “Competent” and “Not Competent.” The percentages in the first row are the number of portfolios judged competent.

How are student portfolios rated by their teachers?

	ENGL 10				Diff	ENGL 5A/5B			
	N	Mid	Final	Diff		N	Mid	Final	Diff
AY 2008-09	221	3.80	4.50	0.7	221	3.40	4.30	0.9	
AY 2009-10	217	3.50	4.30	0.8	218/244	2.80	3.90	1.1	
AY 2010-11	237	4.01	4.61	0.6	171/161	2.34	3.68	1.34	

All the overall ratings listed in the above tables are on a scale of 1–6. A score of 3 or higher is considered proficient.

- Qualitative research in the report “Findings from the First-year Writing Portfolio Assessment Project 2007/08” found that English 5A/B students seemed to be working at a more sophisticated level with their writing than English 10 students. We collected 120 portfolios from 10 teachers’ classes, 5 from English 10 and 5 from English 5B. These portfolios were read and coded for particular outcomes: 1) Joining Academic Conversations, 2) Language Use, 3) Reading Engagement, 4) Reflection, 5) Research, 6) Writing Process, and 7) Writing Rhetorically. Using Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, Gee), we looked for students’ work to speak for itself; that is, we agreed to read student portfolios as description of course outcomes, not necessary as some sort of “evidence” of students “right” or “wrong” demonstration of the outcomes. We found that while many English 10 portfolios represented the learning outcomes strongly, in general, 5B students, as a whole, produced more complex and interesting writing. Specifically, in the outcomes of Joining Academic Conversations, Reflection, Research and Writing Rhetorically, English 5B students seem to be working at a more sophisticated level.
- English 5A/B creates Learning Communities, a well-researched practice for retention. In focus groups, English 5A/B teachers said that their class was like a learning community because by the second semester students knew each other and they saw each other improve. The teacher was ready to start right in without the beginning of the semester orientation stuff, and students were prepared to get going as well.

WHY NOT MAINSTREAMING (ONE COURSE WITH SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION)?

In addition to the research stated above to show that our DPS program is appropriate for students' ability levels, confidence, morale, and improvement in writing, there are a couple more factors to address why mainstreaming is not an appropriate option for our students.

- The failure rates have fallen with our new program, in comparison to the old program. Asao Inoue, our previous assessment coordinator, wrote several articles about our First-Year Writing Program. He notes in "Grading Contracts: Assessing Their Effectiveness on Different Racial Formations" that failure rates have fallen from 16% with our old program (pre 2006-07) to 9% with the new program.
- In comparison, our new program is better for retention. Research by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness compared our current program (DSP) with our previous program (mainstreaming). They found that "Eng 5A/B appears to have a positive effect on retention rates."
- The CSU campus where we originally got the mainstreaming idea from and based our old program on, has, as of 2012, changed their approach to DSP with a stretch option.

CURRENT PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

While we have lots of evidence that our program is working, we also recognize that there is always room and opportunity for improvement. Here are some of the things we are working on:

- We regularly update and revise curriculum and course resources based on teacher feedback about the courses, our experience of students' abilities in the courses, and in relation to national standards for writing in the discipline.
- We meet with instructors in English 5A and 5B / 10 to read and discuss student midterm and final portfolios. This helps teachers to be on the same page when assessing student writing, and it gives our program coherence as far as what a passing portfolio looks like.
- In the summer of 2015, we created Early Start curriculum that better bridges the high school with the college experience and prepares students for making the best choice when they place themselves in an appropriate first-year writing course.
- In the summer of 2015, we piloted a Directed Self-Placement Inventory process that will help students to make a better decision. We are currently revising the Self Inventory and are considering ways to implement it.

THE FIRST-YEAR WRITING PROGRAM'S BOLD NEW VISION

RECOMMENDATION 1: Eliminate or reduce the reliance on all timed writing (EPT) and multiple-choice tests (ACT and SAT) as ways to place students into First-Year Writing courses, and support DSP on this campus and systemwide.

As demonstrated above, both the EPT and tests such as the ACT and SAT are not the best option for placing students in writing courses. Further, DSP allows writing to be created and evaluated at the end of the semester, after students have had a chance to write on topics they choose, go through a revision process (the way professional writers do), and select their best writing to be evaluated. DSP is a better option for student placement and evaluation of writing ability than any timed writing test.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Eliminate the Early Start English Requirement.

As English Council, a committee of English faculty across the CSU, has argued in the “CSU English Council Position Statement: Mandatory Early Start,” Early Start is discriminatory, punitive, places undue financial burden on students, has no valid evidence that it works as intended, and is in direct opposition to the values of Directed Self-Placement. Students should just be able to choose which class or set of classes they want to take to meet their GE requirement for college writing and not have to take a summer course to start their remediation. Early Start creates an additional and unnecessary bottleneck for students getting into the university.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Lower class sizes from 25 to 20 in all First-Year Writing Classes.

This measure, thoroughly supported by research in our discipline and strongly advocated by our professional organizations, would allow the instructor to give first-year writing students more individual attention and increase their chances of success not only in first-year writing classes but also in their entire academic career at the university.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Lower the full time equivalent for lecturers teaching writing courses from 5 to 4 courses.

Teaching first-year writing courses effectively requires frequent extensive responses to students’ writing assignments, which means a much heavier per-course workload for the instructor. To ensure a meaningful and effective teaching and learning condition in first-year writing, we recommend that the full time teaching load for lecturers be reduced to four classes.

Additionally, for both recommendations 3 and 4, Alice Horning’s “The Definitive Article on Class Size” provides important information. In this meta-analysis of research on class size, Horning argues that writing classes are ideally positioned for the positive effects of lower class size:

- Alexander Astin’s work *What Matters in College?* used a “wide range of measure of student success and satisfaction. . .[and] reported that low student-faculty ratio has a positive impact on student satisfaction in terms of relationships, quality of teaching and on virtually all other aspects of students’ experiences. . . [and] has a positive impact on whether students finish their degrees” (12).
- Richard Light’s research in *Making the Most of College* reports on more than sixteen hundred interviews with undergraduates in over 20 colleges of different types over a number of years. He finds, “Student after student brings up the importance of class size in his or her academic development” (15).

- Nancy Sommers and Laura Saltz's study of four hundred students over four years entitled "The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year" found "The students themselves reported that writing is an essential element by which they get 'invited into their education'" (16).
- Richard Haswell's "Class Sizes for First-Year Regular and Basic Writing Courses: Data Collected from the WPA-L, 1998-1999, 2003-2004" provides a conservative estimate of time involved in teaching a typical first-year writing course: "25 students, four substantial out of class essays, one required individual conference, end of the semester portfolio of writing. The total is 231 hours. That is the most conservative estimate, and a more realistic one probably would add at least 20-30 hours. Notice that an 8 hour day of 15 weeks of 5 working days a week adds up to 600 hours. With two writing courses, and with one third the preparation time allowed for the second course (30 minutes instead of 90) the total is 402 hours. With three writing courses, the teacher is already working overtime (633 hours)" (17-18).
- National organizations' recommendations for class size and teaching load: CCCC (the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the college arm of NCTE) no more than 20 per class; ideally 15. No more than 60 writing students a term. ADE (Association of Departments of English): no more than 3 sections per term, no more than 15 students per course, no more than 60 students per term. (18-19)

APPENDIX A: DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT DECISION CHART

In order to choose your option, read the descriptions below and decide which of the three best describes your reading and writing abilities.

OPTION 1		OPTION 2		OPTION 3	
<i>I think of myself as a strong reader and writer.</i>		<i>I think of myself as an average reader and writer.</i>		<i>I spoke another language besides English when growing up, OR a language other than English is used in my home.</i>	
READING:		READING:		AND	
I am comfortable reading complex essays and take notes as I read.	I feel reading can be boring and hard and I don't really do much other than just read and put it away.	READING AND VOCABULARY:		<i>I am fluent in spoken English but it takes me a long time to read and write in English.</i>	
When I read, I make connections to other things I have read or experienced as a means of understanding a reading.	When I read, I am still not sure what the author's point was, and it is difficult to explain how the reading relates to anything.	I often lose the meaning when I read because I get stuck on words I don't understand.			
I feel comfortable identifying the structure and organization of the things I read.	I would like to learn more about how writers connect and organize ideas in their writing.	I find it challenging to follow main point from section to section when I read.			
WRITING:		WRITING:		WRITING:	
I do well finding topics to write about and I can relate my ideas to the ideas of others.	I have trouble coming up with good topics and ideas for my essays.	I have ideas for writing but it's difficult to express my ideas, so I usually don't write very much..			
I have effective strategies for outlining and organizing my writing.	I am unsure of myself when I plan my writing and could use tips on planning strategies.	When I make paragraphs, the point isn't always clear and the sentences don't seem to flow.			
I feel comfortable doing research, know how to locate and evaluate sources and relate them to my own writing.	I need to improve my research skills and learn how to use outside sources in my writing.	I need help with writing effective sentences and editing grammar mistakes in my writing.			
I am confident about the conventions of grammar, punctuation, and spelling.	I could use some brushing up on grammar and punctuation.	CONCLUSION:			
CONCLUSION:	CONCLUSION:	<i>I prefer to take an extra semester to work on my English before taking English 5A and 5B.</i>			
<i>I am ready to work at a quick pace, with the instructor as my guide.</i>	<i>I would prefer to get more practice and help from my instructor as I learn to write college-level assignments.</i>				
ENGLISH 10	ENGLISH 5A AND 5B	LINGUISTICS 6			

APPENDIX B: LIST OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WHO USE DIRECTED SELF-
PLACEMENT WITH A STRETCH OPTION

	DSP	Stretch
California State University, Bakersfield		X
California State University Channel Islands	X	X
California State University, Chico	X	
California State University, Dominguez Hills		X
California State University, East Bay		X
California State University, Fresno	X	X
California State University, Fullerton		
Humboldt State University	X	X
California State University, Long Beach		X
California State University, Los Angeles	X	X
California State University Maritime Academy		
California State University, Monterey Bay	In process	In process
California State University, Northridge		X
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona		X
California State University, Sacramento		X
California State University, San Bernardino	X	X
San Diego State University		
San Francisco State University	X	X
San José State University	X	X
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo		X
California State University San Marcos		
Sonoma State University	X	X
California State University, Stanislaus	X	X

Aurora University
Belmont University, Nashville, TN
Boise State University
Chapman University, Orange, CA
Daniel Webster College
DePauw University
Drew University, Madison, NJ
Eastern Connecticut State University
Governors State University
Grand Valley State University
Illinois State University
Indiana University – Purdue, Ft. Wayne
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
McDaniel College, Westminster, MD
Miami University, Middletown
North Carolina State University
Portland State University
Seton Hall University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Southern New Hampshire University
Southern Oregon University
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Idaho
University of Maine
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Wake Forest University
Wright State University

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS ABOUT DSP AND OUR WRITING
PROGRAM (BY DATE)

Crisco, Ginny. "Teacher Development in a Directed Self-Placement Program: Fostering Responsible Assessment and Engaged Learning." Conference of Writing Program Administrators. Boise, ID. July 2015.

*Inoue, Asao B. "Theorizing Failure in US Writing Assessments." *Research in the Teaching of English*. 48 (February 2014). 330-352.

*Notes that failure rates have fallen from 16% with our old program (pre 2006-07) to 9% with the new program

Inoue, Asao B. "Grading Contracts: Assessing Their Effectiveness on Different Racial Formations." *Race and Writing Assessment*. Eds. Asao B. Inoue and Mya Poe. Peter Lang GMBH 2012.

Ketai, Rachel Lewis. "Race, Remediation, and Readiness: Reassessing the "Self" in Directed Self-Placement." *Race and Writing Assessment*. Eds. Asao B. Inoue and Mya Poe. Peter Lang GMBH 2012.

Inoue, Asao B. and Mya Poe. "Racial Formations in Two Writing Assessments: Revisiting White and Thomas' Findings on the English Placement Test after 30 Years." *Writing Assessment in the 21st Century*. Ed Norbert Elliot and Les Perelman. Hampton Press. 2012.

Crisco, Ginny. "Directed-Self Placement in First-Year Writing" California State University-Sacramento GE Compass Project. March 20, 2009.

Inoue, Asao. "Self Assessment as Programmatic Center: The First-Year Writing Program and Its Assessment at California State University, Fresno." *Composition Forum*. 20 (summer 2009).

Crisco, Ginny, Joseph Eng, Sugie Goen Salter, Kathleen Klompfen, Bob Mayberry, and Daniel Melzer. "Assessment, Placement, and Institutional Change: Strategies for Creating New Writing Realities." Conference on College Composition and Communication. New Orleans, LA, April 2008.

Crisco, Ginny (chair), Josh Geist, Rick Hansen, Jaclyn Hardy, Jennifer Mayer, and Andrea Osteen: "Coming to Agency Through Directed Self-Placement" Conference on College Composition and Communication, New Orleans, LA, April 2008.

Sansone, Elizabeth M. "Determining the Validity of DSP: A Study of the Predictive Validity of Directed Self-Placement at California State University Fresno." Thesis California State University-Sacramento. 2007. Print.

Crisco, Ginny. "The Directed Self-Placement Program at CSU Fresno: Promoting Student Agency through Best Practices in Placement and Assessment" English Council, Burlingame, CA, March 2007.

WORKS CITED

- Ball, Arnetha, Linda Christensen, Cathey Fleischer, Rich Haswell, Jean Ketter, Robert Yagelski, Kathleen Yancey. "The Impact of SAT and ACT Timed Writing Tests." National Council of Teachers of English. 2005. 05 Oct 2015. Web.
- Blakesley, David, Erin J. Harvey, and Erica J. Reynolds. "Southern Illinois University Carbondale as an Institutional Model: The English 100/101 Stretch and Directed Self-Placement Program." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 207-242. Print.
- Breland, Hunter, Brent Bridgemann and Mary E. Fowles. WRITING ASSESSMENT IN ADMISSIONS TO HIGHER EDUCATION: REVIEW AND FRAMEWORK. New York: DEEB, 1999. Web.
- Conley, David T. REDEFINING COLLEGE READINESS. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. March 2007. 5 Oct 2015. Web.
- Cornell, Cynthia E. and Robert D. Newton. "The Case of a Small Liberal Arts University: Directed Self-Placement at DePauw." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 149-178. Print.
- Chernekoff, Janice. "Introducing Directed Self-Placement to Kutztown University." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 127-148. Print.
- Crisco, Virginia and Jennifer Mayer. "The First-Year Writing Portfolio Assessment Project Report." California State University-Fresno. Department of English: First-Year Writing Program. 2007. 05 Oct 2015. Web.
- CSU English Council. "Position Statement: Mandatory Early Start" CSU English Council. 2010. 05 Oct 2015. Web.
- Elbow, Peter. "Directed Self-Placement in Relation to Assessment: Shifting the Crunch from Entrance to Exit." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 15-30. Print.
- Frus, Phyllis. "Directed Self-Placement at a Large Research University: A Writing Center Perspective." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 179-192. Print.
- Glau, Greg. "Stretch at 10." JOURNAL OF BASIC WRITING. 26.2 (2007). Print.
- Horning, Alice. "The Definitive Article on Class Size. WPA: WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION. 31.1-2. (Fall / Winter 2007). Print.
- Inoue, Asao B. "FYW Program Assessment – Academic Year 2007-2008." California State University-Fresno. Department of English: First-Year Writing Program. 2008. 05 Oct 2015. Web.
- Inoue, Asao B. "Theorizing Failure in US Writing Assessments." *Research in the Teaching of English*. 48 (February 2014). 330-352.

Leimer, Tina and Hongtao Yue. "Summary Report of DSP Program Evaluation." California State University-Fresno. Department of English: First-Year Writing Program. 2009. 05 Oct 2015. Web.

Matzen, Richard N., Jeff E. Hoyt. "Basic Writing Placement with Holistically Scored Essays: Research Evidence." JOURNAL OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION. 28.1 (2004): 2-4, 6,8,10,12,34.

McKendy, Thomas. "Locally Developed Writing Tests and the Validity of Holistic Scoring." RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH. 26.2 (1992): 148-166.

Olson, Sarah and Debra Touchette. "Placement: Testing" CompFAQs from CompPile. 2011. 05 Oct 2015. Web.

Pinter, Robbie and Ellen Sims. "Directed Self-Placement at Belmont University: Sharing Power, Forming Relationships, Fostering Reflection." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 107-126. Print.

Reynolds, Erica J. "The Role of Self-Efficacy in Writing and Directed Self-Placement." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 73-104. Print.

Royer, Daniel J. and Roger Gilles. "The Pragmatist Foundations of Directed Self-Placement." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 49-72. Print.

Sansone, Elizabeth M. "Determining the Validity of DSP: A Study of the Predictive Validity of Directed Self-Placement at California State University Fresno." Thesis California State University-Sacramento. 2007. Print.

Tompkins, Patrick. "Directed Self-Placement in a Community College Context." DIRECTED SELF-PLACEMENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES. Eds Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003. 193-206. Print.